

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application.

The Office has required restriction to one of the following groups of claims:

Group 1: Claims 1-16, and 20-32 drawn to a laminate, etc.; and

Group 2: Claims 17-19, drawn to a method of making a laminate.

The Office has further identified claims directed to categories of patentably distinct species, including:

(A) method of joining

1. Claims 21, 28
2. Claim 22
3. Claim 23
4. Claims 24, 29
5. Claim 25
6. Claim 26

Applicant provisionally elects with traverse group 1, claims 1-16, and 20-32, and species identified as claim 23. Applicant notes that claims 21 and 24 refer to methods of joining materials in a laminate, while claims 28 and 29 refer to methods of joining of a laminate to a core. Applicant should be entitled to examination of a reasonable number of species, yet the Office has allowed election of only one species among the dependent claims for independent claims 20 and 27. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests examination of at least claims 21-24 and 28-29.

While Applicant agrees that the laminate of claim 1 can be made by a different process than the one recited in claim 17, it does not seem unduly burdensome to examine claims 17-19 along with the claims of Group 1. Therefore, Applicant requests the Examiner to reconsider the restriction requirement and examine the additional claims


Date: June 2, 2005

Customer Number 23735

Telephone: 503-469-4800
FAX: 503-469-4777

Respectfully submitted,

DIGIMARC CORPORATION

By 

Joel R. Meyer
Registration No. 37,677